

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-12 are presently pending in this application. Claims 6, 8, 13 and 14 are cancelled via this Amendment.

Claims 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons indicated in numbered paragraphs 2-4 of the Office Action. The foregoing amendments to claims 4 and 5 are believed to overcome this rejection. As to claim 4, see paragraph [0038] of the specification which refers to Fig. 2 and the “pattern shape of a light source image of the light-emitting element”. As to claims 5-7, the term “array” is generic so as to cover both a single line arrangement and a plurality of rows.

Regarding original dependent claim 3, the Examiner admits that Murata fails to teach or suggest a fluorescent body. However, the Examiner contends that Lee discloses a fluorescent material for use with a headlamp, and specifically references Fig. 1B, element 2. Regardless of whether the Examiner is correct, claim 3 recites that the “fluorescent body [has] a shape that is rotationally asymmetric with respect to said optical axis of said light-emitting element” (emphasis added). Although the Examiner contends that this feature is taught by Lee, Applicants are unable to find any such teaching either in the description or in the drawings. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 12 are hereby amended to recite this feature, and dependent claims 3, 7 and 9 are amended accordingly. All of the claims are believed to be allowable based on this amendment to claims 1 and 12.

Regarding dependent claim 10, it appears that the Examiner may have misread this claim. Claim 10 recites that the semiconductor chips have different “shapes”, not different “sizes”. The Examiner argues that different size semiconductor chips would have been obvious, since this amounts to a “mere change in the size of the component”. But claim 10 refers to different shapes, not sizes. There is no teaching or suggestion in Murata for using semiconductor chips of different shapes to produce different light distribution patterns with differing amounts of diffusion which are then combined to form a combined projected light pattern. Thus, at least claim 10 is believed to be separately patentable.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/699,815

ART UNIT 2875
Q77547

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 21, 2005